

Nonlinear Averaging in Economics

V. P. Maslov*

Abstract

Kolmogorov nonlinear averaging is complemented by a natural axiom. For this averaging, we prove a theorem on large deviations as well as establish the relationship to the tunnel canonical operator

1 Kolmogorov nonlinear averaging

A sequence of functions M_n defines a *regular* type of average if the following conditions are satisfied (Kolmogorov):

- I. $M(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ is continuous and monotone in each variable; to be definite, we assume that M is increasing in each variable;
- II. $M(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ is a symmetric function¹;
- III. the average of identical numbers is equal to their common value:
 $M(x, x, \dots, x) = x$;
- IV. a group of values can be replaced by their own average, without changing the overall average:

$$M(x_1, \dots, x_m, y_1, \dots, y_n) = M_{n+m}(x, \dots, x, y_1, \dots, y_n),$$

where $x = M(x_1, \dots, x_m)$.

Theorem 1.1 (Kolmogorov) *If conditions I–IV are satisfied, the average $M(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ is of the form*

$$M(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = \psi\left(\frac{\varphi(x_1) + \varphi(x_2) + \dots + \varphi(x_n)}{n}\right), \quad (1)$$

where φ is a continuous, strictly monotone function and ψ is its inverse.

For the proof of Theorem 1, see [1].

*Moscow Institute of Electornics and Mathematics, pm@miem.edu.ru

¹In our case, symmetry follows from the Bose statistics of banknotes.

2 Main axiom of averaging

For a stable system, it is fairly obvious that the following axiom must be satisfied:

V. if the same quantity ω is added to each x_k , then the average will increase by the same amount ω .

I have had a detailed discussion of this axiom with the practicing economist V. N. Baturin.

Obviously, in normal conditions, the nonlinear average of x_i must also increase by this amount. We take this fact as *Axiom V*.

This axiom leads to a unique solution in the nonlinear case, i.e., it is naturally satisfied in the linear case (the arithmetic mean) and by a unique (up to an identical constant by which we can multiply all the incomes x_i) nonlinear function.

In fact, the incomes x_i are calculated in some currency and, in general, must be multiplied by some constant β corresponding to the purchasing power of this currency, so that this constant (the parameter β) must be incorporated into the definition of an income. Therefore, we assert that there exists a unique nonlinear function satisfying Axiom V.

The function $\varphi(x)$ is of the form

$$\varphi(x) = C \exp(Dx) + B, \quad (2)$$

where $C, D \neq 0$, and B are numbers independent of x .

3 Semiring: an example of a linear self-adjoint operator

Consider the semiring generated by the nonlinear average and the space L_2 with values in this semiring.

First, consider the heat equation

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = \frac{h}{2} \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2}. \quad (3)$$

Here h is a small parameter, whose smallness is not needed at this point.

Equation (3) is linear. As is well known, this means that if u_1 and u_2 are its solutions, then their linear combination

$$u = \lambda_1 u_1 + \lambda_2 u_2 \quad (4)$$

is also its solution. Here λ_1 and λ_2 are constants.

Next, we make the following substitution. Let

$$u = e^{-M/h}. \quad (5)$$

Then the new unknown function $M(x, t)$ satisfies the nonlinear equation

$$\frac{\partial M}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial M}{\partial x} \right)^2 - \frac{h}{2} \frac{\partial^2 M}{\partial x^2} = 0. \quad (6)$$

This well known equation is sometimes called the *Bürgers equation*².

To the solution u_1 of Eq. (3) there corresponds the solution $M_1 = -h \ln u_1$ of Eq. (6) and to the solution u_2 of Eq. (3) there corresponds the solution $M_2 = -h \ln u_2$ of Eq. (6). To the solution (4) of Eq. (3) there corresponds the solution

$$M = -h \ln(e^{-(M_1+\mu_1)/h} + e^{-(M_2+\mu_2)/h}),$$

where $\mu_i = -h \ln \lambda_i$, $i = 1, 2$.

Hence Eq. (6) is also linear, but it is linear in the function space with the following operations:

- the operation of addition $a \oplus b = -h \ln(e^{-a/h} + e^{-b/h})$;
- the operation of multiplication $a \odot \lambda = a + \lambda$.

Now, the substitution $M = -h \ln u$ takes zero to infinity and one to zero. Thus, in this new space, the generalized zero is ∞ : $\mathbf{0} = \infty$, and the generalized unit is the ordinary zero: $\mathbf{1} = 0$. The function space in which the operations $\oplus$ and $\odot$ have been introduced together with the zero $\mathbf{0}$ and the unit $\mathbf{1}$ is isomorphic to the ordinary function space with ordinary multiplication and addition.

We can thus imagine that, somewhere on another planet, people have grown accustomed to the newly introduced operations $\oplus$ and $\odot$ and, from their point of view, Eq. (6) is linear.

All this, of course, is trivial and there is no need for people living on our planet to learn new arithmetical operations, because we can,

²The ordinary Bürgers equation is obtained from (6) by differentiating with respect to x and substituting $v = \partial M / \partial x$.

by a change of function, pass from Eq. (6) to Eq. (3), which is linear in the accepted meaning. However, it turns out that the “kingdom of crooked mirrors,” which this semiring yields, is related to “capitalist” economics [2].

In the function space with values in the ring $a \oplus b = -h \ln(e^{-a/h} + e^{-b/h})$, $\lambda \odot b = \lambda + b$, we introduce the inner product

$$(M_1, M_2) = -h \ln \int e^{(M_1 + W_2)/h} dx.$$

Let us show that it possesses bilinear properties in this space; namely,

$$(a \oplus b, c) = (a, c) \oplus (b, c), \quad (\lambda \odot a, c) = \lambda \odot (a, c).$$

Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} (a \oplus b, c) &= -h \ln \left(\int \exp \left(\frac{-(-h \ln(e^{-a/h} + e^{-b/h}) + c)}{h} \right) dx \right) \quad (7) \\ &= -h \ln \left(\int (e^{-a/h} + e^{-b/h}) e^{-c/h} dx \right) \\ &= -h \ln \left(\int e^{-(a+c)/h} dx + \int e^{-(b+c)/h} dx \right) = (a, c) \oplus (b, c), \\ (\lambda \odot a, c) &= -h \ln \int e^{-(a+\lambda)/h} e^{-c/h} dx \\ &= -h \ln \left(e^{-\lambda/h} \int e^{-(a+c)/h} dx \right) = \lambda + \ln \int e^{-(a+c)/h} dx = \lambda \odot (a, c). \end{aligned}$$

Let us give an example of a self-adjoint operator in this space. Consider the operator

$$L W \rightarrow W \odot \left(-h \ln \left(\frac{(W')^2}{h^2} - \frac{W''}{h} \right) \right).$$

And now let us verify its self-adjointness:

$$\begin{aligned}
(W_1, LW_2) &= -h \ln \int e^{-(W_1+LW_2)/h} dx \\
&= -h \ln \int \exp \left[- \left(W_1 + W_2 - h \ln \left(\frac{(W_2')^2}{h^2} - \frac{W_2''}{h} \right) \right) / h \right] dx \\
&= -h \ln \int e^{-W_1/h} e^{-W_2/h} \left(\frac{(W_2')^2}{h^2} - \frac{W_2''}{h} \right) dx = -h \ln \int e^{-W_1/h} \frac{d^2}{dx^2} e^{-W_2/h} dx \\
&= -h \ln \int \frac{d^2}{dx^2} e^{-W_1/h} e^{-W_2/h} dx = -h \ln \int e^{-W_1/h} \left(\frac{(W_1')^2}{h^2} - \frac{W_1''}{h} \right) e^{-W_2/h} dx \\
&= -h \ln \int \exp \left[- \left(W_1 - h \ln \left(\frac{(W_1')^2}{h^2} - \frac{W_1''}{h} \right) \right) / h \right] dx \\
&= -h \ln \int e^{-(LW_1+W_2)/h} dx = (LW_1, W_2).
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

It is also easy to verify linearity.

We construct the resolving operator of the Burgers equation: $LW_0 \rightarrow W$, where W is the solution of Eq. (6) satisfying the initial condition $W|_{t=0} = 0$.

The solution of Eq. (3) satisfying the condition $u|_{t=0} = u_0$ is of the form

$$u = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi h}} \int e^{-(x-\xi)^2/2th} u_0(\xi) d\xi.$$

Taking into account the fact that $u = e^{-W/h}$, $W = -h \ln u$, we obtain the resolving operator L_t of the Burgers equation:

$$L_t W_0 = -\frac{h}{\sqrt{2\pi h}} \ln \int e^{-((x-\xi)^2/2th + M(\xi)/h)} d\xi. \tag{9}$$

The operator L_t is self-adjoint in terms of the new inner product.

4 Theorem on the nonlinear average

Consider a collection of prices λ_i , where $i = 1, \dots, n$, and a collection of numbers g_i equal to the number of financial instruments (FI), which are shares, bonds, etc., of *different types* having the price λ_i . The prices λ_i are, by definition, positive numbers; without loss of generality, we can further assume that the prices are numbered so as to satisfy the inequalities

$$0 < \lambda_1 < \lambda_i < \lambda_n \quad \text{for all } i = 2, \dots, n-1. \tag{10}$$

The total number of FIs of different type is denoted by G . This number is

$$G = \sum_{i=1}^n g_i. \quad (11)$$

Let k_i denote the number of FIs purchased at the price λ_i . Since g_i different FIs are sold at the price λ_i , it follows that the number of different methods of buying k_i FI's at the price λ_i can be expressed by

$$\gamma_i(k_i) = \frac{(k_i + g_i - 1)!}{k_i! (g_i - 1)!}. \quad (12)$$

The number of different methods of buying the collection $\{k\}$ of FIs consisting of $k_1, \dots, k_n$ FIs bought at corresponding prices $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$, is expressed by (12) and is equal to

$$\gamma(\{k\}) = \prod_{i=1}^n \gamma_i(k_i) = \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{(k_i + g_i - 1)!}{k_i! (g_i - 1)!}. \quad (13)$$

The expenditure of the buyer in the purchase of the collection FI $\{k\}$ is equal to

$$\mathcal{B}(\{k\}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i k_i. \quad (14)$$

Let us carry out nonlinear averaging of the expenditure (14) over budget restraints:

$$M(\beta, N) = -\frac{1}{\beta N} \ln \left(\frac{N! (G - 1)!}{(N + G - 1)!} \sum_{\{k_i=N\}} \gamma(\{k\}) \exp(-\beta \mathcal{B}(\{k\})) \right), \quad (15)$$

where β is a positive parameter.

We split the FIs arbitrarily into m nonintersecting groups, where $m \leq n$. This implies that, by employing some method, we choose two sequences i_α and j_α , where $\alpha = 1, \dots, m$, satisfying the conditions

$$i_\alpha \leq j_\alpha, \quad i_{\alpha+1} = j_\alpha + 1, \quad \alpha = 1, \dots, m, \quad i_1 = 1, \quad j_m = n, \quad (16)$$

and assume that the FIs are contained in the group indexed by α if the number i of its price λ_i satisfies the condition $i_\alpha \leq i \leq j_\alpha$. Note that there are a number of ways by which we can choose the sequences i_α and j_α satisfying conditions (16).

The number of FIs contained in the group indexed by α is expressed by the formula

$$G_\alpha = \sum_{i=i_\alpha}^{j_\alpha} g_i, \quad (17)$$

while the number of FIs bought from the group with number α in the purchase of the collection $\{k\} = k_1, \dots, k_n$, is expressed by the formula

$$N_\alpha = \sum_{i=i_\alpha}^{j_\alpha} k_i. \quad (18)$$

The collection $\{k\}$ satisfies condition (31); therefore, the collection of numbers N_α satisfies the equality

$$\sum_{\alpha=1}^m N_\alpha = N; \quad (19)$$

also, it follows from (11) that the number G_α satisfies the relation

$$\sum_{\alpha=1}^m G_\alpha = G. \quad (20)$$

Here G depends on N so that the following relation holds:

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{G}{N} = \tilde{g} > 0. \quad (21)$$

In addition, we assume that the partition of the FIs into the groups (16) satisfies the following condition: m is independent of N , and the G_α depend on N so that the following relations hold:

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{G_\alpha}{N} = \tilde{g}_\alpha > 0 \quad \text{for all } \alpha = 1, \dots, m. \quad (22)$$

Hence

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N_\alpha}{N} \approx \bar{n}_\alpha > 0, \quad \sum \bar{n}_\alpha = 1.$$

By (20), the quantities $\tilde{g}_\alpha$ and $\tilde{g}$ are related by

$$\sum_{\alpha=1}^m \tilde{g}_\alpha = \tilde{g}. \quad (23)$$

We denote

$$\mathcal{N}_\alpha(\beta, N) = \sum_{i=i_\alpha}^{j_\alpha} \frac{g_i}{\exp(\beta(\lambda_i + \nu)) - 1}, \quad (24)$$

where $\delta > 0$ is an arbitrary parameter and ν is specified by the equation

$$N = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{g_i}{\exp(\beta(\lambda_i + \nu)) - 1}. \quad (25)$$

Further, we use the notation

$$\Gamma(\beta, N) = \frac{(N + G - 1)!}{N!(G - 1)!} \exp(-\beta N M(\beta, N)). \quad (26)$$

We can also consider the case $\beta < 0$; moreover, for $\beta < 0$, we choose the solution of Eq. (25) satisfying the condition $\nu < -\lambda_n$ and, for $\beta > 0$, we choose the solution satisfying the condition $\nu > -\lambda_1$.

Theorem 4.1 *Let condition (22) be satisfied, and let $\Delta = aN^{3/4+\delta}$, where a and $\delta < 1/3$ are positive parameters independent of N . Then, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, the following relation holds as $N \rightarrow \infty$, regardless of the value of N :*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\Gamma(\beta, N)} \sum_{\sum \{k_i\}=N, \sum_{\alpha=1}^m (N_\alpha(\{k\}) - \mathcal{N}_\alpha(\beta, N))^2 \geq \Delta} \gamma(\{k\}) \exp(-\beta \mathcal{B}(\{k\})) \\ = O\left(\exp\left(-\frac{(1-\varepsilon)a^2 N^{1/2+2\delta}}{2\tilde{g}d}\right)\right), \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

where d is defined by

$$d = \begin{cases} \frac{\exp(-\beta(\lambda_1 + \nu))}{(\exp(-\beta(\lambda_1 + \nu)) - 1)^2} & \text{for } \beta < 0, \\ \frac{\exp(-\beta(\lambda_n + \nu))}{(\exp(-\beta(\lambda_n + \nu)) - 1)^2} & \text{for } \beta > 0. \end{cases} \quad (28)$$

In other words, the contribution to the average expenditure of the buyer from the number N_α of the purchased FI's (of the order of N), which differs from $\mathcal{N}_\alpha(\beta, N)$ by a value $O(N^{3/4+\delta})$, is of exponentially small value.

Thus, for the case in which the FIs can be divided into sufficiently large groups (condition (22)), given a fixed nonlinear average expenditure of the buyer, the number of purchased FIs belonging to the group α is, in most cases, approximately equal to $\mathcal{N}_\alpha(\beta, N)$, which is an analog of the law of large numbers.

To find β , we propose the following method. Suppose we are given a collection N_α^a of actual purchases from the group α , $\alpha = 1, 2, \dots, m$, of financial instruments. Consider the following function of β :

$$DN(\beta) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^m (N_\alpha^a - \mathcal{N}_\alpha(\beta, \nu_\alpha))^2, \quad (29)$$

where $\mathcal{N}_\alpha(\beta, \nu_\alpha)$ is given by (24). For β we take the value for which the function (29) attains its minimum.

The minimum of this value, which can be specified, for example, at the stock exchange, shows the degree of randomness of the distribution of FIs over the portfolios of the traders. If the minimum is zero, then the distribution over the portfolios is random (see [3]).

Before proving the theorem, we shall prove several assertions and lemmas.

Suppose that the buyer possesses a sum of money B (budget restraint), but not all of this sum is necessarily spent on purchases; suppose that the buyer purchases N FIs. The total number of different types of purchase corresponding to the N purchased FIs when the sum of money spent does not exceed B can be expressed by the formula [4]

$$\sigma(B, N) = \sum_{\{k=N\}} \gamma(\{k\}) \Theta(B - \mathcal{B}(\{k\})). \quad (30)$$

Here $\mathcal{B}(\{k\}) \leq B$, $\mathcal{B}(\{k\})$ is defined by (14), $\Theta(x)$ is the Heaviside function:

$$\Theta(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } x < 0, \\ 1 & \text{for } x \geq 0, \end{cases}$$

and $\sum_{\{k\}}^N$ denotes the sum over all collections $\{k\}$ of nonnegative integers $k_1, \dots, k_n$ satisfying the condition

$$\sum_{i=1}^n k_i = N. \quad (31)$$

Note that, by (10), the expenditure (14) for any collection $\{k\}$ fulfilling condition (31) satisfies the inequalities

$$0 < N\lambda_1 \leq \mathcal{B}(\{k\}) \leq N\lambda_n. \quad (32)$$

The number $\sigma(B, N)$ (30) of different types of purchase is a piecewise constant function of the variable B and possesses the following properties:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(B, N) &\leq \sigma(B', N) && \text{for } B \leq B', \\ \sigma(B, N) &= 0 && \text{for } B < N\lambda_1, \\ \sigma(B, N) &= \sigma(N\lambda_n, N) && \text{for } B \geq N\lambda_n. \end{aligned}$$

These properties of $\sigma(B, N)$ follow immediately from the definition (30) and inequality (32).

Proposition 4.2 *For any positive β and any N , the following identity holds:*

$$\int_0^\infty e^{-\beta B} d\sigma(B, N) = \Gamma(\beta, N). \quad (33)$$

Proof. Substituting (30) into the left-hand side of relation (33) and changing the order of summation and integration, we obtain

$$\int_0^\infty e^{-\beta B} d\sigma(B, N) = \sum_{\{k\}}^N \gamma(\{k\}) \int_0^\infty e^{-\beta B} d\Theta(B - \mathcal{B}(\{k\})). \quad (34)$$

Next, we use the equality

$$\int_0^\infty e^{-\beta B} d\Theta(B - B_0) = e^{-\beta B_0}, \quad (35)$$

which is valid for all positive β and B_0 . Taking (35) into account, from (34) we obtain the following equality:

$$\int_0^\infty e^{-\beta B} d\sigma(B, N) = \sum_{\{k\}}^N \gamma(\{k\}) \exp(-\beta \mathcal{B}(\{k\})). \quad (36)$$

It follows from (15) and (26) that the expression on the right-hand side of relation (36) is equal to $\Gamma(\beta, N)$. Thus, the proposition is proved.

We introduce the following function $\zeta(\beta, \nu)$ defined for all $\nu > -\lambda_1$ and $\beta > 0$:

$$\zeta(\beta, \nu) = \sum_{N=0}^{\infty} \Gamma(\beta, N) e^{-\beta N \nu}. \quad (37)$$

Proposition 4.3 *For all $\nu > -\lambda_1$ and $\beta > 0$, the following relation holds:*

$$\zeta(\beta, \nu) = \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{(1 - \exp(-\beta(\lambda_i + \nu)))^{g_i}}. \quad (38)$$

Proof. By formulas (15), (26), we have

$$\sum_{N=0}^{\infty} \Gamma(\beta, N) e^{-\beta N \nu} = \sum_{N=0}^{\infty} e^{-\beta N \nu} \sum_{\{k\}}^N \gamma(\{k\}) \exp(-\beta \mathcal{B}(\{k\})). \quad (39)$$

Taking into account the explicit form of $\gamma(\{k\})$ (13) and $\mathcal{B}(\{k\})$ (see (14)), we find that the sum in relation (39) splits into the following product of sums:

$$\sum_{N=0}^{\infty} e^{-\beta N \nu} \sum_{\{k\}}^N \gamma(\{k\}) \exp(-\beta \mathcal{B}(\{k\})) = \prod_{i=1}^n \left(\sum_{k_i=1}^{\infty} \frac{(k_i + g_i - 1)!}{k_i! (g_i - 1)!} e^{-\beta(\lambda_i + \nu)k_i} \right). \quad (40)$$

We now use the equality

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(k + g - 1)!}{k! (g - 1)!} x^k = \frac{1}{(1 - x)^g}, \quad (41)$$

valid for any natural number g and any x such that $|x| < 1$. Since $\nu > -\lambda_1$ and $\beta > 0$, by (41) from (37), (39), (40) we obtain (38). The assertion is proved.

In order to prove certain properties of the function $\Gamma(\beta, N)$ (see (26)), we shall use the following lemma.

Lemma 4.4 *The functions $z_n(x_1, \dots, x_n; N)$ given by*

$$z_l(x_1, \dots, x_l; N) = \sum_{\{k\}}^N \exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^l x_i k_i\right), \quad (42)$$

where l and N are arbitrary integers satisfying the conditions $l \geq 2$ and $N \geq 1$, satisfy, for all real numbers $x_1, \dots, x_n$, the inequality

$$z_l(x_1, \dots, x_l, N)^2 > z_l(x_1, \dots, x_l, N - 1) z_l(x_1, \dots, x_l, N + 1). \quad (43)$$

Proof. Let us prove the lemma by induction. First, we prove that (43) is valid for $l = 2$. If $l = 2$ and $x_2 = x_1$, then, for all nonnegative integers N , the function (42) is equal to

$$z_2(x_1, x_1; N) = \sum_{k=0}^N e^{x_1 N} = (N+1)e^{x_1 N},$$

and it can be verified by elementary means that, in that case, inequality (43) holds. If $l = 2$ and $x_2 \neq x_1$, then, for all nonnegative integers N , the function (42) is of the form

$$z_2(x_1, x_2; N) = \sum_{k=0}^N e^{x_1 k + x_2 (N-k)} = e^{x_2 N} \frac{1 - e^{(x_1 - x_2)(N+1)}}{1 - e^{x_1 - x_2}}. \quad (44)$$

Substituting (44) into (43), after a few manipulations we find that, in the case under consideration, inequality (43) is equivalent to the following inequality:

$$\frac{1}{2} (e^{x_1 - x_2} + e^{x_2 - x_1}) > 1. \quad (45)$$

However, since the function $y(x) = \exp(x)$ is convex, inequality (45) holds for all numbers x_1 and x_2 not equal to one another. Thus, inequality (43) is proved for $l = 2$. Next, suppose that inequality (43) is proved for $l = k$, where $k \geq 2$, and let us prove that this inequality holds for $n = l + 1$. Note that the functions (42) possess the following property, which is a trivial consequence of their explicit form:

$$z_{k+1}(x_1, \dots, x_{k+1}; N) = e^{x_{k+1} N} \sum_{m=0}^N z_k(\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_k; m), \quad (46)$$

where $\tilde{x}_i = x_i - x_{k+1}$, $i = 1, \dots, k$. Substituting (46) into inequality (43) and carrying out a few manipulations, we see that inequality (43) for $n = k + 1$ is equivalent to the inequality

$$z_k(\tilde{x}; 0)z_k(\tilde{x}; N) + \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} (z_k(\tilde{x}; k+1)z_k(\tilde{x}; N) - z_k(\tilde{x}; k)z_k(\tilde{x}; N+1)) > 0, \quad (47)$$

where $z_k(\tilde{x}; m)$ denotes $z_k(\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_k; m)$. By assumption, inequality (43) holds for $n = k$; this implies that, for all $k = 0, \dots, N-1$, we have

$$z_k(\tilde{x}; k+1)z_k(\tilde{x}; N) - z_k(\tilde{x}; k)z_k(\tilde{x}; N+1) > 0, \quad (48)$$

and hence all summands on the left-hand side of inequality (47) are positive, i.e., inequality (47) holds. Thus, the validity of (43) for $l = k + 1$ is proved and, therefore, the assertion of the lemma is also proved by induction.

Lemma 1 implies the convexity of the logarithm of the function $\Gamma(\beta, N)$ (given by (26)) with respect to the discrete variable N .

Proposition 4.5 *For all natural numbers N and all positive numbers β , the following inequalities hold:*

$$\Gamma(\beta, N)^2 > \Gamma(\beta, N - 1)\Gamma(\beta, N + 1), \quad (49)$$

$$\Gamma(\beta, N - 1) < e^{\beta\lambda_1}\Gamma(\beta, N). \quad (50)$$

Proof. To prove these inequalities, it suffices to note that, in view of formula (15), $\Gamma(\beta, N)$ (26) can be written in the form

$$\Gamma(\beta, N) = \sum_{\{k\}}^N \gamma(\{k\}) \exp(-\beta\mathcal{B}(\{k\})). \quad (51)$$

The right-hand side of relation (51) is equal to the function (42) for

$$l = G, \quad x_1 = \cdots = x_{g_1} = -\beta\lambda_1, \quad x_{g_1+1} = \cdots = x_{g_1+g_2} = -\beta\lambda_2, \quad \dots, \quad (52)$$

$$x_{G-g_n+1} = \cdots = x_G = -\beta\lambda_G;$$

this equality follows from the formula

$$\sum_{0 \leq m_1, \dots, m_g}^{m_1 + \dots + m_g = k} 1 = \frac{(k + g - 1)!}{k! (g - 1)!}.$$

Thus, inequality (49) is a consequence of (43) and, to prove (50), it suffices to use relation (46).

Property (49) implies another property of $\Gamma(\beta, N)$.

Proposition 4.6 *For any given positive β and for any nonnegative integer N , there exists a number $\nu > -\lambda_1$ such that, for all $N' \neq N$,*

$$\Gamma(\beta, N)e^{-\beta N\nu} > \Gamma(\beta, N')e^{-\beta N'\nu}. \quad (53)$$

Proof. Using (49), we choose any ν satisfying the inequality

$$\frac{1}{\beta} \ln \left(\frac{\Gamma(\beta, N+1)}{\Gamma(\beta, N)} \right) < \nu < \frac{1}{\beta} \ln \left(\frac{\Gamma(\beta, N)}{\Gamma(\beta, N-1)} \right). \quad (54)$$

It follows from (50) that such a ν also satisfies the inequality $\nu > -\lambda_1$. Moreover, inequalities (49) and (54) imply the inequalities

$$e^{-\beta(N'+1)\nu} \Gamma(\beta, N'+1) > e^{-\beta N' \nu} \Gamma(\beta, N') \quad \text{for all } N', \quad 0 \leq N' \leq N-1, \quad (55)$$

$$e^{-\beta(N'+1)\nu} \Gamma(\beta, N'+1) < e^{-\beta N' \nu} \Gamma(\beta, N') \quad \text{for all } N', \quad N \leq N'.$$

However, the validity of inequalities (55) implies that of inequality (53) for all $N' \neq N$. The proposition is proved.

Next, let us prove another lemma, which gives an estimate of the nonlinear average (15) via relation (37). Suppose that p_l , $l = 0, 1, \dots$, is a sequence of numbers satisfying the conditions

$$p_l \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } l = 0, 1, \dots, \quad \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} p_l = 1, \quad (56)$$

and also

$$\bar{l} \equiv \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} l p_l < \infty, \quad (57)$$

$$Dl \equiv \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} (l - \bar{l})^2 p_l < \infty. \quad (58)$$

It follows from conditions (56) that the numbers p_l are bounded above and we can choose one of the maximal numbers among them. In other words, there exists an index, which will be denoted by L , such that the following condition is satisfied:

$$p_L \geq p_l \quad \text{for all } l = 0, 1, \dots. \quad (59)$$

Lemma 4.7 *For an arbitrary sequence of numbers p_l , $l = 0, 1, \dots$, satisfying conditions (56)–(59) the following inequalities hold:*

$$|L - \bar{l}| \leq (3Dl)^{3/4}, \quad (60)$$

$$p_L \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{27Dl}}. \quad (61)$$

*** **Proof.** For any $\Delta > 0$, the following Chebyshev inequality holds:

$$\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} p_l \Theta(|l - \bar{l}| - \Delta) \leq \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} p_l \frac{(l - \bar{l})^2}{\Delta^2} = \frac{Dl}{\Delta^2}. \quad (62)$$

It follows from (62), (56), and (59) that, for any $\Delta > 0$, we have the chain of inequalities

$$2\Delta p_L \geq \sum_{|l - \bar{l}| < \Delta} p_l \geq 1 - \frac{Dl}{\Delta^2}. \quad (63)$$

From (63) we obtain

$$p_L \geq \frac{1}{2\Delta} \left(1 - \frac{Dl}{\Delta^2} \right) \quad \text{for any } \Delta > 0. \quad (64)$$

It can be easily shown that the function on the right-hand side of inequality (64) attains its maximum value (with respect to the variable Δ) equal to $1/\sqrt{27Dl}$ at $\Delta = \sqrt{3Dn}$. Inequality (61) is thus proved. Now, take $\Delta = |L - \bar{l}|$; then it follows from (62) and (56) that

$$p_L \leq \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} p_l \Theta(|l - \bar{l}| - |L - \bar{l}|) \leq \frac{Dl}{(L - \bar{l})^2}. \quad (65)$$

Taking (61) into account, from (65) we obtain inequality (60).

To each group there corresponds a particular nonlinear averaging of the expenditure; as in (15), the averaging of the expenditure for FIs from the group with index α can be expressed by the formula

$$M_\alpha(\beta, N_\alpha) = -\frac{1}{\beta N_\alpha} \ln \left(\frac{N_\alpha! (G_\alpha - 1)!}{(N_\alpha + G_\alpha - 1)!} \sum_{\{k\}_\alpha} \prod_{i=i_\alpha}^{j_\alpha} (\gamma_i(k_i) e^{-\beta \lambda_i k_i}) \right), \quad (66)$$

where $\gamma_i(k_i)$ is given by formula (12) and $\sum_{\{k\}_\alpha}^{N_\alpha}$ denotes the sum over all collections $\{k\}_\alpha$ of nonnegative integers $k_{i_\alpha}, \dots, k_{j_\alpha}$ satisfying condition (18). As in (26) and (37), for all nonnegative integers N_α , for all $\beta > 0$, and all $\nu > -\lambda_1$, we define the functions

$$\Gamma_\alpha(\beta, N_\alpha) = \frac{(N_\alpha + G_\alpha - 1)!}{N_\alpha! (G_\alpha - 1)!} \exp(-\beta N_\alpha M_\alpha(\beta, N_\alpha)), \quad (67)$$

$$\zeta_\alpha(\beta, \nu) = \sum_{N_\alpha=0}^{\infty} \Gamma_\alpha(\beta, N_\alpha) e^{-\beta N_\alpha \nu}. \quad (68)$$

Proposition 4.8 *The following relations hold:*

$$\Gamma(\beta, N) = \sum_{\{N_\alpha\}}^N \prod_{\alpha=1}^m \Gamma_\alpha(\beta, N_\alpha), \quad (69)$$

$$\zeta(\beta, \nu) = \prod_{\alpha=1}^m \zeta_\alpha(\beta, \nu), \quad (70)$$

$$\zeta_\alpha(\beta, \nu) = \prod_{i=i_\alpha}^{j_\alpha} \frac{1}{(1 - \exp(-\beta(\lambda_i + \nu)))^{g_i}}, \quad (71)$$

where $\sum_{\{N_\alpha\}}^N$ denotes the sum over all collections $\{N_\alpha\}$ of nonnegative integers $N_1, \dots, N_m$ satisfying condition (19).

Proof. Relations (70) and (71) follow from (38). To prove (69), it suffices to use formula (51) and take into account the fact that, for all $\Gamma_\alpha(\beta, N_\alpha)$, $\alpha = 1, \dots, m$, similar formulas hold, and also use the fact that, in formula (51), the summands of the sum split into products, which follows from the explicit forms of $\gamma(\{k\})$ (13) and $\mathcal{B}(\{k\})$ (14).

The average number of FIs belonging to the group with index α in the overall purchase of N FIs is determined as a function of β as follows:

$$\bar{N}_\alpha(\beta, N) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\beta, N)} \sum_{\{k\}}^N N_\alpha(\{k\}) \gamma(\{k\}) \exp(-\beta \mathcal{B}(\{k\})), \quad (72)$$

where $N_\alpha(\{k\})$ depends on the collection $\{k\}$ by formula (18). In studying the averages (72), we also need the following functions:

$$\tilde{N}(\beta, \nu) = \frac{1}{\zeta(\beta, \nu)} \sum_{N=0}^{\infty} N \Gamma(\beta, N) e^{-\beta N \nu}, \quad (73)$$

$$D\tilde{N}(\beta, \nu) = \frac{1}{\zeta(\beta, \nu)} \sum_{N=0}^{\infty} (N - \bar{N}(\beta, \nu))^2 \Gamma(\beta, N) e^{-\beta N \nu}, \quad (74)$$

$$\tilde{N}_\alpha(\beta, \nu) = \frac{1}{\zeta(\beta, \nu)} \sum_{\{k\}} N_\alpha(\{k\}) \gamma(\{k\}) \exp(-\beta(\mathcal{B}(\{k\}) + \nu N(\{k\}))), \quad (75)$$

$$D\tilde{N}_\alpha(\beta, \nu) = \frac{1}{\zeta(\beta, \nu)} \sum_{\{k\}} (N_\alpha(\{k\}) - \tilde{N}_\alpha(\beta, \nu))^2 \gamma(\{k\}) \exp(-\beta(\mathcal{B}(\{k\}) + \nu N(\{k\}))), \quad (76)$$

where $N(\{k\})$ depends on the collection $\{k\}$ by formula (31) and $\sum_{\{k\}}$ denotes the sum over all collections $\{k\}$ of nonnegative integers $k_1, \dots, k_n$.

Proposition 4.9 *The functions (73)–(76) satisfy the identities*

$$\tilde{N}(\beta, \nu) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{g_i}{\exp(\beta(\lambda_i + \nu)) - 1}, \quad (77)$$

$$D\tilde{N}(\beta, \nu) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{g_i \exp(\beta(\lambda_i + \nu))}{(\exp(\beta(\lambda_i + \nu)) - 1)^2}, \quad (78)$$

$$\tilde{N}_\alpha(\beta, \nu) = \sum_{i=i_\alpha}^{j_\alpha} \frac{g_i}{\exp(\beta(\lambda_i + \nu)) - 1}, \quad (79)$$

$$D\tilde{N}_\alpha(\beta, \nu) = \sum_{i=i_\alpha}^{j_\alpha} \frac{g_i \exp(\beta(\lambda_i + \nu))}{(\exp(\beta(\lambda_i + \nu)) - 1)^2}. \quad (80)$$

Proof. First, note that the functions (73) and (74) can be written as

$$\tilde{N}(\beta, \nu) = -\frac{1}{\beta} \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} \ln(\zeta(\beta, \nu)), \quad (81)$$

$$D\tilde{N}(\beta, \nu) = -\frac{1}{\beta} \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} \tilde{N}(\beta, \nu); \quad (82)$$

this can be verified by differentiating $\zeta(\beta, \nu)$ (37). Next, substituting (38) into (81) and (82), we obtain (77) and (78). Now, taking into account the explicit form of $\gamma(\{k\})$ (13) and $\mathcal{B}(\{k\})$ (14) as well as formulas (66), (67), and (70), we can write expressions (75), (76) in a form similar to (73), (74):

$$\tilde{N}_\alpha(\beta, \nu) = \frac{1}{\zeta_\alpha(\beta, \nu)} \sum_{N_\alpha=0}^{\infty} N_\alpha \Gamma_\alpha(\beta, N_\alpha) e^{-\beta N_\alpha \nu}, \quad (83)$$

$$D\tilde{N}_\alpha(\beta, \nu) = \frac{1}{\zeta_\alpha(\beta, \nu)} \sum_{N_\alpha=0}^{\infty} (N_\alpha - \bar{N}_\alpha(\beta, \nu))^2 \Gamma_\alpha(\beta, N_\alpha) e^{-\beta N_\alpha \nu}. \quad (84)$$

Therefore, the functions (75) and (76) satisfy formulas similar to (81) and (82), only $\zeta(\beta, \nu)$ must be replaced by $\zeta_\alpha(\beta, \nu)$; substituting (71) into these formulas, we obtain (79) and (80). The proposition is proved.

In order to prove the exponential estimate in the assertion of Theorem 2, we shall use the following assertion.

Proposition 4.10 *For all positive Δ , the following inequality holds:*

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\zeta(\beta, \nu)} \sum_{\{k\}} \Theta \left(\sum_{\alpha=1}^m |N_\alpha - \tilde{N}_\alpha(\beta, \nu)| - \Delta \right) \gamma(\{k\}) \exp(\beta(\mathcal{B}(\{k\}) + \nu N(\{k\}))) \\ & \leq 2^m \exp \left(-\frac{\Delta^2}{2Gd} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (85)$$

where d is defined by formula (28).

Proof. We use the following properties of the hyperbolic cosine $\cosh(x) = (e^x + e^{-x})/2$:

$$\prod_{\alpha=1}^m \cosh(x_\alpha) \geq \left(\cosh \left(\frac{\Delta}{m} \right) \right)^m \quad \forall x_\alpha : \sum_{\alpha=1}^m |x_\alpha| \geq \Delta, \quad \frac{1}{\cosh(x)} \leq 2e^{-x}. \quad (86)$$

Inequalities (86), together with formula (69), lead to the following (exponential) Chebyshev inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\{k\}} \Theta \left(\sum_{\alpha=1}^m |N_\alpha - \tilde{N}_\alpha(\beta, \nu)| - \Delta \right) \gamma(\{k\}) \exp(\beta(\mathcal{B}(\{k\}) + \nu N(\{k\}))) \\ & \leq 2^m e^{-c\Delta} \prod_{\alpha=1}^m \left(\sum_{N_\alpha=0}^{\infty} \Gamma_\alpha(\beta, N_\alpha) e^{\beta \nu N_\alpha} \cosh(c(N_\alpha - \tilde{N}_\alpha(\beta, \nu))) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (87)$$

where c is an arbitrary positive number. Taking (68) and (70) into account, we rewrite (87) in the form

$$\frac{1}{\zeta(\beta, \nu)} \sum_{\{k\}} \Theta \left(\sum_{\alpha=1}^m |N_\alpha - \tilde{N}_\alpha(\beta, \nu)| - \Delta \right) \gamma(\{k\}) \exp(\beta(\mathcal{B}(\{k\}) + \nu N(\{k\}))) \quad (1)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \leq 2^m e^{-c\Delta} \prod_{\alpha=1}^m \frac{1}{2\zeta_\alpha(\beta, \nu)} \left(\exp(-c\tilde{N}_\alpha(\beta, \nu)) \zeta_\alpha \left(\beta, \nu + \frac{c}{\beta} \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \exp(c\tilde{N}_\alpha(\beta, \nu)) \zeta_\alpha \left(\beta, \nu - \frac{c}{\beta} \right) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (88)$$

Further, we use the identity

$$\begin{aligned} \ln\left(\zeta_\alpha\left(\beta, \nu + \frac{c}{\beta}\right)\right) &= \ln(\zeta_\alpha(\beta, \nu)) + \frac{c}{\beta} \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} \ln(\zeta_\alpha(\beta, \nu)) \\ &+ \int_\nu^{\nu+c/\beta} d\nu' \left(\nu + \frac{c}{\beta} - \nu'\right) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \nu'^2} \ln(\zeta_\alpha(\beta, \nu')), \end{aligned} \quad (89)$$

which holds because the function (71) can be differentiated twice with respect to the variable ν . From the explicit form of the function $\zeta_\alpha(\beta, \nu)$ (71), we obtain

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \nu^2} \ln(\zeta_\alpha(\beta, \nu)) = \beta^2 \sum_{i=i_\alpha}^{j_\alpha} \frac{g_i \exp(-\beta(\lambda_i + \nu))}{(\exp(-\beta(\lambda_i + \nu)) - 1)^2} \leq \beta^2 G_\alpha d, \quad (90)$$

where d is expressed by (28). Using inequality (90) and formulas (79) and (81), from (89) we obtain the inequality

$$-c\tilde{N}_\alpha(\beta, \nu) + \ln\left(\zeta_\alpha\left(\beta, \nu + \frac{c}{\beta}\right)\right) - \ln(\zeta_\alpha(\beta, \nu)) \leq \frac{G_\alpha}{2} dc^2. \quad (91)$$

By (91) and (20), from (88) we obtain the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\zeta(\beta, \nu)} \sum_{\{k\}} \Theta\left(\sum_{\alpha=1}^m |N_\alpha - \tilde{N}_\alpha(\beta, \nu)| - \Delta\right) \gamma(\{k\}) \exp(\beta(\mathcal{B}(\{k\}) + \nu N(\{k\}))) \\ \leq 2^m \exp\left(-c\Delta + \frac{Gdc^2}{2}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (92)$$

The expression on the right-hand side of inequality (92) contains an arbitrary positive parameter c ; it attains its minimum equal to $2^m \exp(-\Delta^2/2d)$ at $c = \Delta/d$, and hence inequality (85) is a consequence of (92). The proposition is proved.

Let us suppose that λ_1 and λ_n are independent of N ; by (10), this implies that the prices λ_i , $i = 1, \dots, n$, lie in an interval independent of N . The form of the dependence of n on N is not specified, since it does not affect the results obtained. It should only be noted that, by (11), we have $n \leq G$. The conditions formulated above essentially restrict neither the choice of λ_i and g_i nor that of the partition of FIs into groups. Because of this, we cannot write the asymptotics of the nonlinear averages (15) and (66) and of the averages (72) in the limit

as $N \rightarrow \infty$ in the general case; however, it turns out that we can prove some properties of these averages in such a limiting case.

Proof of Theorem 2. By Proposition 4, for given β and N , we choose a ν' such that inequality (53) holds. By formulas (37), (38) and (73), (74), (77), (78), the sequence

$$p_l = \frac{\Gamma(\beta, l) e^{\beta l \nu'}}{\zeta(\beta, \nu')}$$

is a sequence for which Lemma 2 is applicable. This means that for given β , N , and the corresponding ν' , the following inequalities hold:

$$|\tilde{N}(\beta, \nu') - N| \leq (3D\tilde{N}(\beta, \nu'))^{3/4}, \quad (93)$$

$$1 > \frac{\Gamma(\beta, N) e^{\beta N \nu'}}{\zeta(\beta, \nu')} \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{27D\tilde{N}(\beta, \nu')}}. \quad (94)$$

Now, note that the function $\tilde{N}(\beta, \nu)$ (77) possesses the following properties for all $\nu > -\lambda_1$ if $\beta < 0$ and all $\nu < -\lambda_n$ if $\beta > 0$:

$$\tilde{N}(\beta, \nu) \geq 0, \quad \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{N}(\beta, \nu) = 0, \quad \lim_{\nu \rightarrow -\lambda_1 + 0} \tilde{N}(\beta, \nu) = \lim_{\nu \rightarrow -\lambda_n - 0} \tilde{N}(\beta, \nu) = +\infty, \quad (95)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\beta} \frac{\partial \tilde{N}}{\partial \nu}(\beta, \nu) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{g_i \exp(-\beta(\lambda_i + \nu))}{(\exp(-\beta(\lambda_i + \nu)) - 1)^2} > 0, \\ \left| \frac{\partial \tilde{N}}{\partial \nu}(\beta, \nu) \right| &\leq \begin{cases} -\frac{\beta G \exp(-\beta(\lambda_1 + \nu))}{(\exp(-\beta(\lambda_1 + \nu)) - 1)^2} & \text{for } \beta < 0, \\ \frac{\beta G \exp(-\beta(\lambda_n + \nu))}{(\exp(-\beta(\lambda_n + \nu)) - 1)^2} & \text{for } \beta > 0. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

By (95), first, equation (25) has a solution $\nu > -\lambda_1$ for all $\beta < 0$ and $\nu < -\lambda_n$ for all $\beta > 0$; we denote this solution by $\nu(\beta, N)$. Second, it follows from (93) and (95) that

$$\nu' = \nu(\beta, N) + O\left(\frac{1}{N^{1/4}}\right), \quad (96)$$

because, by (10), $D\tilde{N}(\beta, \nu)$ (78) satisfies the estimate

$$\frac{-\beta G \exp(-\beta(\lambda_n + \nu))}{(\exp(-\beta(\lambda_n + \nu)) - 1)^2} \leq D\tilde{N}(\beta, \nu) \leq \frac{-\beta G \exp(-\beta(\lambda_1 + \nu))}{(\exp(-\beta(\lambda_1 + \nu)) - 1)^2} \quad \text{for } \beta < 0, \quad (97)$$

$$\frac{\beta G \exp(-\beta(\lambda_1 + \nu))}{(\exp(-\beta(\lambda_1 + \nu)) - 1)^2} \leq D\tilde{N}(\beta, \nu) \leq \frac{\beta G \exp(-\beta(\lambda_n + \nu))}{(\exp(-\beta(\lambda_n + \nu)) - 1)^2} \quad \text{for } \beta > 0$$

and G increases in the same way as N by condition (21). Let us now take into account the fact that the functions $\tilde{N}_\alpha(\beta, \nu)$ satisfy identity (79), and, therefore, they possess properties similar to (95). Then it follows from (96), (79), (95) and the definitions of $\mathcal{N}_\alpha(\beta, N)$ (24) that

$$|\mathcal{N}_\alpha(\beta, N) - \tilde{N}_\alpha(\beta, \nu')| = O(N^{3/4}). \quad (98)$$

Next, suppose that $\Delta = aN^{3/4+\delta}$, where a and δ are arbitrary positive parameters independent of N . If the condition

$$|\tilde{N}_\alpha(\beta, \nu') - N_\alpha| \geq \Delta,$$

is satisfied, then the following condition is satisfied for sufficiently large N :

$$\sum_{\alpha=1}^m |\mathcal{N}_\alpha(\beta, N) - N_\alpha| \geq \Delta' = \Delta - \sum_{\alpha=1}^m |\mathcal{N}_\alpha(\beta, N) - \tilde{N}_\alpha(\beta, \nu')|.$$

This yields the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\{k\}} \Theta \left(\sum_{\alpha=1}^m |N_\alpha - \mathcal{N}_\alpha(\beta, \nu)| - \Delta \right) \gamma(\{k\}) \exp(\beta(\mathcal{B}(\{k\}) + \nu N(\{k\}))) \\ & \leq \sum_{\{k\}} \Theta \left(\sum_{\alpha=1}^m |N_\alpha - \tilde{N}_\alpha(\beta, \nu')| - \Delta' \right) \gamma(\{k\}) \exp(\beta(\mathcal{B}(\{k\}) + \nu N(\{k\}))). \end{aligned} \quad (99)$$

In view of (98) and (43), the following estimate holds for any parameter $\varepsilon > 0$ independent of N and for all positive a and δ as $N \rightarrow \infty$:

$$\sqrt{N} \exp\left(-\frac{\Delta'^2}{2Gd}\right) = O\left(\exp\left(-\frac{(1-\varepsilon)a^2 N^{1/2+2\delta}}{2\tilde{g}d}\right)\right). \quad (100)$$

Relations (85), (94), and (100) yield (27). The theorem is proved.

Here we have studied the case $\beta > 0$. In exactly the same way, we may consider the case $\beta < 0$. If we take $\nu < -\alpha_n$ everywhere, then we shall obtain the same results.

5 The tunnel canonical operator in economics

Equilibrium prices are determined from the condition of the equality between supply and demand in each commodity and resource. Similarly, the following pairs are determined: “flows of commodities and

services–prices”; “flows of labor resources–level of wages”; “flows of natural resources–rents”; and “loan interest rate–loan volume.”

The asymptotics of M and $\bar{M}$ is given by the tunnel canonical operator in the phase space of pairs [5].

We consider the phase space $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$, where the intensive quantities play the role of coordinates and the extensive ones, of momenta. In economics, the role of the values of the random variable λ_i can be played by the prices of the corresponding commodities and N_i is, for example, the number of commodities sold, i.e., the number of people who have bought of this commodity or the bank rate of the i th bank, etc. Obviously, the price depends on the demand, i.e., $\lambda_i(N_i)$ is a curve in two-dimensional phase space. In two-dimensional phase space, to each point (vector) λ_i , $i = 1, \dots, n$, there corresponds a vector $N_i(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. In a more general case, we deal with an $N@$ -dimensional manifold (surface), where the “coordinates” and the “momenta” locally depend on n parameters and, moreover, a certain condition holds: the Lagrange brackets of the “coordinates” and of “the momenta” with respect to these parameters are zero. Therefore, the author has called such a manifold *Lagrangian*. In other words, we can say that the form $\sum N_i d\lambda_i$ is closed (see the concluding remarks in [6] and [7]). Hence $\int N_i d\lambda_i$ is independent of the path and, just as in mechanics, $\int p dq$ (p is the momentum, q is the coordinate), can be called an *action*.

The producer buys resources and transforms a resource expenditure vector into a commodity production vector. The consumer buys these commodities. Accordingly, the equilibrium prices for resources and for consumer goods are determined by the equalities given above (see also [8]–[17]).

In addition to such equilibrium prices, vertical pairs of isolated consumer goods and pairs “seller–buyer,” i.e., “permanent seller–permanent buyer,” can also be formed and the corresponding prices related to this pairs are generated. The analog in quantum statistics are Cooper pairs.

This construction requires the use of the ultrasecond quantization method in an abstract algebraic form which could be applicable in economics. Such a theory leads to the formation of “vertical” clusters. The method in question is developed in another paper.

References

- [1] A. N. Kolmogorov, in: *Selected Works in Mathematics and Mechanics* [in Russian], 1985, pp. 136–137.
- [2] V. P. Maslov, “Axioms of nonlinear averaging in financial mathematics and stock-price dynamics,” *Teor. Veroyatnost. i Primenen.* [*Theory Probab. Appl.*], **48** (2003), no. 4, 800–810.
- [3] “‘Zero Intelligence’ Trading Closely Mimics Stock Market,” in: <http://www.newscientist.com/article.ns?id=dn6948>, Katharine Davis, 05/02/01; see also other sites with reference to “Zero Intelligence.”
- [4] V. V. V’yugin and V. P. Maslov, “A concentration theorem for entropy and free energy,” *Problemy Peredachi Informatsii* [*Problems Inform. Transmission*], **41** (2005), no. 2, 72–88.
- [5] V. P. Maslov, “Geometric “quantization” of thermodynamics and statistical corrections at critical points,” *Teoret. Mat. Fiz.* [*Theoret. and Math. Phys.*], **101** (1994), no. 3, 433–441.
- [6] J. Heading, “Introduction to the phase-interval method,” in: *Afterword to the book: V. P. Maslov, The WKB method in the multidimensional case*, Mir, Moscow, 1965.
- [7] V. P. Maslov, *Perturbation Theory and Asymptotic Methods* [in Russian], Izd. Moskov. Univ., Moscow, 1965.
- [8] V. P. Maslov, “Approximative probabilities, the law of a quastable market, and the phase transition from “condensate” state,” *Dokl. Ross. Akad. Nauk* [*Russian Acad. Sci. Dokl. Math.*], **392** (2003), no. 6, 727–732.
- [9] V. P. Maslov, “Integral equations and phase transitions in probabilistic games: Analogy with statistical physics,” *Teor. Veroyatnost. i Primenen.* [*Theory Probab. Appl.*], **48** (2003), no. 2, 482–502.
- [10] V. P. Maslov, “Econophysics and quantum statistics,” *Mat. Zametki* [*Math. Notes*], **72** (2002), no. 6, 883–891.
- [11] V. P. Maslov, “Dependence of the purchasing power and the average income of the population on the number of buyers on a specialized market and in a region: The laws of econophysics,” *Dokl. Ross. Akad. Nauk* [*Russian Acad. Sci. Dokl. Math.*], **395** (2004), no. 2, 164–168.

- [12] V. P. Maslov, “Consumer expenditure and turnover rate under nonlinear financial averaging: The laws of econophysics,” *Dokl. Ross. Akad. Nauk* [*Russian Acad. Sci. Dokl. Math.*], **396** (2004), no. 2.
- [13] V. P. Maslov, “Nonlinear financial averaging, the evolution process, and the laws of econophysics,” *Teor. Veroyatnost. i Primenen.* [*Theory Probab. Appl.*], **49** (2004), no. 2, 34.
- [14] V. P. Maslov, “A quasistable economy and its connection with the thermodynamics of a superfluid: A default as a phase transition of zeroth kind. 1,” *Survey of Applied and Industrial Mathematics*, **11** (2004), no. 4, 690-732; **12** (2005), no. 1, 3–40.
- [15] V. N. Baturin, S. G. Lebedev, V. P. Maslov, B. I. Sadovnikov, and A. Chebotarev, “Reconstruction of the Pareto distribution in the domain of high incomes,” *Russian Economic Science of Current Interest* (2005), no. 3.
- [16] V. P. Maslov, “Quantum economics,” *Russian J. Math. Phys.*, **12** (2005), no. 2, 219–231.
- [17] V. P. Maslov, “Capitalistic mathematics,” in: *Manuscript at www.viktor-maslov.narod.ru*, 2005.